

**AB 75 Principal Training Advisory Group Meeting  
December 20, 2001**

**DISCUSSION SUMMARY**

**Purpose and desired outcome of meeting**

Chairperson Dave Gordon began the meeting by explaining that the group would be reviewing draft criteria in content areas 2, 3, and 4 today. He explained that the group had not had much time to review the current version of the draft criteria, which is quite extensive. He stated that the group's role is to review the draft today and guide the revision of the document. He stated that there will be an additional meeting so that the public and the group has a final opportunity to comment. He encouraged the group to listen to Alice Furry (the author of the draft) today as she frames the document and puts it in context.

**Message from the State Board of Education**

John Mockler, Executive Director, State Board of Education, then addressed the Advisory Group. He described the Board's interest in leveraging both AB 75 and AB 466 to expand capacity in Reading Language Arts and English Language Development. He explained that these programs should be linked to achieve continuity and focus. He noted that AB 961 is also linked to AB 466 and AB 75. He explained that the State Board is required to consult with the CTC and others, saying to the Advisory Group, "You are the others." He told the group that the Board appreciates their work and supported the decision to have another meeting in January. He stated that in particular the Board needs guidance on the allotment of time in different content areas, noting that there is limited money and time to work with. He discussed briefly the issue of the State Board approving providers who can provide the entire training. He explained that today's goal is for the group to look at the draft criteria in content areas 2, 3, and 4, and give staff direction to draft a document that covers all the content areas, is consistent throughout, and lays out time allocations in different content areas. He also explained that there should be as little paperwork as possible for school districts to apply, such as a short one-page document that asks the districts to make certain assurances, including an assurance that they will use an approved provider. He described how the Superintendent of Public Instruction will notify districts of their eligibility and require these assurances. The State Board will review applications from prospective providers. The burden will be on the provider to do what it says it will do. We presume the provider (possibly by creating partnerships) can provide the entire package. Finally, he stated that he hoped that after this meeting we will have enough guidance to move the draft along in time to make the February State Board meeting.

**Introduction to Draft Criteria for AB 75 Content Areas 2, 3, & 4**

Dave Gordon introduced Alice Furry of the Sacramento County Office of Education (SCOE), who authored the draft criteria in content areas 2, 3, and 4. She discussed the connection between this bill and AB 466. She explained that SCOE has also been contracted to develop criteria for approving providers for AB 466. AB 466 is a comprehensive professional development effort for K-12 classroom teachers. It is

envisioned that 225,000 teachers will receive training on the new State Board-adopted standards, a minimum of 5 days (40 hours) with 80 hours of follow-up in the academic year. AB 75 is the principal training piece. The question is how can we support principals to be instructional leaders given the AB 466 focus on math and reading language arts? The attention in AB 75 is in those two content areas. She stated that teachers in AB 466 training would have principals who have participated in similar training. She discussed that California is experiencing a crisis in reading, that it has been shown that a high proportion of middle school and high school students are not comprehending what they read. She emphasized that AB 75 must include training on the instructional programs used in principals' schools and must also focus on assessment.

Advisory Group member Richard Navarro thanked Alice Furry for her extensive work. He stated that he agreed with the goal to build some alignment and integration between AB 466 and AB 75, and asked if it could be achieved without being so prescriptive. He stated that there were some sections in the draft that he would find valuable as a teacher, but not necessarily as a principal.

Alice Furry responded that her organization has spent 2 years in LAUSD implementing the model [that is used as a basis for the draft criteria]. She agreed that the experience of receiving such explicit material is new to most. She noted that they have not been successful with a more flexible model. She emphasized that the training is not just about reading but about responding to California laws and guaranteeing that every child master world class standards. She described how teachers shifted in their response to the training. At first it was somewhat negative, but then changed to positive. Principals were trained for less time, and it was difficult to get them to focus on the content at first. But by the end of the year, they understood that it is about the teaching and wanted even more explicit content. Now they are committed to knowing about the content. They have to be able to see distinctions between teachers who are doing it right and those who are not. She stressed the importance of principals being trained in this in small groups.

Advisory Group member Genaro Carapia stated that he acknowledges the value of the state's vision. As a principal, he doesn't have to develop his own vision independently. He stated that it has been rewarding for him to see the change in teachers who at first hated "scripted" instructional programs. He stated that the transformation has been incredible in LAUSD. He has participated in the training sponsored by Alice Furry and her group. He agreed that principals need to see what the teachers are teaching our children. He stated the value of having done some of the lessons and having a colleague look at his teaching. He stated that he wishes to validate everything that Alice has said.

## **Public comment**

Speaker: Pat Hamilton, ACSA.

The speaker stated that Alice Furry has provided some of the dialogue. She stated that she would continue to participate as a listener.

Speaker: Stephanie Couch, Digital California Project (DCP).

The speaker described a series of regional meetings to discuss technology and professional development. She stated the importance of training being at convenient times and locations, and that DCP could help to meet that goal. She explained that several pieces of the training could be provided online and that DCP provides county offices of education and local educational agencies with access to high-speed networks.

### **Review and Discussion of Draft Criteria for AB 75 Content Areas 2, 3, & 4**

At this point Dave Gordon opened up a discussion of the draft materials. He asked the group to provide Alice Furry with feedback on how to improve the materials.

State Board member Susan Tacheny, liaison to the Advisory group, began by cautioning that we should not set up a false dichotomy between specificity and creativity. Specificity is not the enemy of creativity. The challenge here is the tension between this ideal and having no one who can live up to the ideal. She referenced the many written materials listed in the draft criteria, and asked Alice Furry, “Do you envision every vendor developing these on their own? Or do we develop materials with a common pot of money?”

Alice Furry responded that we need to be sensitive to the role of provider, saying that they will want as much clarity as possible. We need to clarify terms and there should be some standardized pieces regarding the direction the state is going. Providers need to keep to the basics. There should be some reference materials to assist the provider – not requirements, but as resources. If 90% of the work [in Content Areas 2, 3, and 4] is focused on instructional programs, then many of the materials will be standardized because the publishers produce standardized materials already. As long as the criteria are closely tied to the instructional program, there will be standardization. The materials selected by provider may vary.

Teresa Garcia, Assistant Secretary of Education, stated that the draft is very comprehensive. She asked how this model is working for the LAUSD principals who have already received a lot of instruction in the same areas. She stated that we don’t want to reteach them something they already know. Alice Furry stated that they are proposing that providers state whether they are offering basic/beginning entry and/or advanced entry. She stated that this training could be done at an advanced level, that the criteria are general enough that providers could offer both basic and advanced levels of training with them. She noted that the Board would have to agree that advanced proposals are indeed advanced.

Advisory Group member Linda Bond complimented Alice Furry on the incredible amount of work she had done. She stated that at the CTC they had crosswalked the proposed training with the national standards for administrators and found it to be all there. She asked Alice Furry how much time was available in the training she did in LAUSD, and whether the time available in AB 75 was enough. Alice Furry responded that in their first effort they’d had 24 hours to handle these issues and that it felt rushed. They haven’t tried a full 5 days for principals [as is proposed here]. She noted that principals were given multiple opportunities to attend, so that if they missed day 3 they

could make up day 3 at another time. She stated that good logistics planning is under the control of the district.

Linda Bond asked about support offered to principals when they went back to their job situations, and whether it was built in here. Alice Furry referred to the follow-up portion of the criteria, which suggests a model that could incorporate coaches and master teachers. The model includes classroom walk-throughs during the year. She described the use of reflective essays in her program. She is proposing that 60 hours out of the 80 hours of follow-up be devoted to Content Areas 2, 3, and 4.

Linda Bond then asked how the assessment in the follow-up component is related to the content in the first part of the training. Alice Furry replied that it all aligns, that principals are prepared in the core training to do the follow-up activities such as the walk-throughs. She further explained how reflective papers were used for assessment. They required that every person who did a reflective paper get a written response from the person critiquing it. Scorers judged a series of responses and got rich information by comparing responses done at the beginning and the end of the program.

Dave Gordon asked for clarification on the proposed amount of time allocated to Content Areas 2, 3, and 4. Alice Furry responded that she proposed that 40 of the first 80 hours be devoted to these three content areas, and 60 of the 80 follow-up hours.

Advisory Group ex-officio member Jay Schenirer stated that we should focus on desired results. If we define and get these results, we can afford more flexibility [in terms of delivery]. These could be suggested guidelines, rather than hard and fast rules. He stated that he doesn't agree with John Mockler about the need for time allocations but rather thinks that can be left to the provider. He emphasized that we don't want to crowd out the leadership part. A principal could have the skills defined as desired results in the proposed training, but still not be able to move the school through change. Principals need to learn to lead. Also, we don't want to crowd out technology; we need to weave technology and leadership in. After being asked a question by Alice Furry, Schenirer clarified that the allotment of 50% of the first 80 hours of training for Content Areas 2, 3, and 4 is not too great, but that technology and leadership should be woven into those hours.

Dave Gordon stated that there is a lot of training on standards now and asked if there is a way to document what principals have already done. He raised the question of whether the training could be structured around desired outcomes.

Alice Furry suggested returning to the definitions of areas 2, 3, and 4, which address the instructional programs. She stated that principals spending time to just identify standards is not useful because the standards are already embedded in the instructional programs. If principals are already competent on the standards, and know all the domains, strands, and substrands, then the next step is getting them to work closely with teachers in their classrooms. She acknowledged that this is harder for middle and high school principals. She suggested perhaps relaxing the content requirements in other content areas and

reiterated that the follow-up piece is totally individualized to the principal's school site. She also stressed that the 5 days of training in these areas do not need to be delivered in a row – this is flexible, though the content is not.

Dave Gordon raised the question of whether all principals would be given the same 40 hours. Alice Furry said yes, for math, because instructional materials were just adopted. It was mentioned that if local education agencies were not satisfied with the advanced level offered by a provider, they could propose their own training programs to the board for approval.

Advisory Group member Betsy Eaves stated that in her work she sees technical training [in how to improve student achievement] lacking in almost all principals, yet principals are held accountable. It is the technical work of leadership that is lacking. Principals need to know: How do kids learn? How do you move your school forward? How do you get that to happen? It is the provider's responsibility to propose training on this, and districts responsibility to choose a provider that will do this for them. The fact that this [proposed training] is so focused makes people uncomfortable, but it is very important. The fact that it is focused is what will make it possible for principals to improve schools; these criteria [will ensure that providers] tell them how to do it.

Advisory Group ex-officio member Joni Samples stated that she likes the specificity, saying that this is designed around what is important to us, and we need to allow principals to be successful. She also posed some questions. First, AB 75 talks about core curriculum areas, but where are science and social studies in these criteria?

Alice Furry responded that these subject areas are addressed in the high school criteria, but not in elementary. She stated that there may be opportunities to shift science and social science over [into the program] at the local level. She noted that the criteria ask for principals to review their district's policy on instructional minutes, and that some local boards may be modifying those minutes as a result of new initiatives. So middle schools may want to recommend that other core subjects be included in the principal training. We could open the door on that. But because there are new programs in reading/language arts and math, this will be important for most districts. Also, the decision was to go with where the standards are being measured. Joni Samples suggested that subjects other than reading and math could perhaps be part of the advanced level of training that is offered.

Joni Samples asked if with this much specificity in the criteria, if there will be a way to change the focus when, for example, there is a new adoption? Alice Furry responded that good providers are constantly modifying their materials. The State Board could always modify criteria to key off of a new adoption of instructional materials and notify providers.

Joni Samples asked about possible providers, saying "How many can meet this level of specificity and deliver what is required?" Alice Furry responded that right now several publishers have formed new companies [that can provide training around instructional

materials] so they can organize and come before the State Board for approval. She noted that there are already quite extensive materials in mathematics. She stated that once we get started, providers will adapt. It won't be competitive until districts start to pick and choose.

Advisory Group member Doris Alvarez asked how a charter school would fit in to these criteria. She noted that charter schools don't necessarily use the district-adopted curriculum. Dave Gordon asked, "If they aren't using State Board-adopted materials, are they not eligible?" Teresa Garcia responded that this must be tied to state-adopted materials, so if they don't use the materials, they are not eligible.

Doris Alvarez stated that she didn't see rigor addressed in the draft criteria. How would principals recognize rigor [in the classroom]? This is important at the high school level. Alice Furry responded that we should follow the logic of the K-8 model, that it's about full implementation of all standards and the extent to which teachers are using district-adopted materials. Provider will have to scurry around to find what instructional materials local school boards have adopted. There is no restriction on cross-district collaborations; providers could go to the State Board for approval of training on a particular instructional program, then advertise to districts who use that program.

Doris Alvarez noted the importance of examining student work and suggested including time for this.

Dave Gordon reiterated that the question of how to acknowledge charter schools had been raised, saying "We need to be clear how they will participate."

Advisory Group member Rowland Baker stated that he was initially uncomfortable with the draft, especially when he reviewed it out of context and with a very short timeline. We need to have discussion in context, he said, and was pleased that the group will meet again to review another draft. If this is so prescribed, will it be workable for small districts? Reference to district personnel may not apply, and requirements for things like training displays may be a problem. He expressed concern about logistics in rural areas, and whether there are enough service providers to do this training, especially in rural areas. Last, how is the instructional technology piece woven in?

Alice Furry noted that we have three years to implement this program, and that maybe new legislation could be introduced to roll it over for another 3 years. She agreed that we must find a way to use technology. In light of the new adoptions, a lot of technology-based material that is available does not match these instructional programs. We want to help our teachers with what they do each day, and if the technology does not match the instructional program it is a problem for the teacher and the principal. The local education agency really has greater responsibility for many of the personnel and scheduling decisions.

Rowland Baker said that some of the questions he frequently hears are "What's a good resource?" and "How can I use this to assist me in my job?" He stated that he

envision more technology woven into content areas 2, 3, and 4. We might need more specificity on what instructional technology we want to see included, rather than just leaving it to the materials in the instructional programs. Principals need to know how to disaggregate data and present it. Dave Gordon added that the disconnect is that we haven't obligated publishers to integrate technology into their core materials.

Suzanne Tacheny commented that the draft is written in a way that seems so specific, but it could be written in different ways. The intent isn't to give a script, but to name all the touchstones. The draft makes it sound like it's a preplanned program but there are actually many ways that it could be put together. We can finesse this, soften it up a bit. The desired results are good, but we need the direction, too.

Richard Navarro referenced the Richard Elmore piece that the Advisory Group read, and asked, "Are we really providing the guidelines to achieve the goals we have?" He stated that he would prefer to make this suggested content, rather than required. If the desired results are stated up front, he said, then providers can demonstrate how they will achieve these results. He said that he would leave his comments on the draft with Alice Furry and would go through a couple of them now. First he stated that the issue of English language learners needs to be embedded throughout the document. This issue needs to be addressed at every level, including high school. Alice Furry responded that this will be addressed in the next draft.

Next Richard Navarro urged the group to keep in mind three dimensions in regards to technology. First is instructional materials. We need to push harder to ensure that there are standards-aligned technology materials. Second is the use of technology as decision-making tools. Third is the use of technology for delivery of instruction. He mentioned the use of the DCP as a powerful way to overcome geographical distance. He also mentioned making more information available on the web for principals. Last, he stated that each school district must complete a technology plan and that principals need to know what the plan is. Alice Furry responded that that is suitable for content area 5. Jay Schenirer noted that the group has talked about integrating the technology piece in content areas 2, 3, and 4. He suggested that principals be required to come with their STAR assessment data and be taught to manipulate them with technology. Alice Furry responded that this requirement is in the draft. She stressed the importance of providers and districts working together to determine what is useful. Districts need to tell the provider what they need, what technology they have to work with.

Dave Gordon noted that the criteria that deal with technology and fiscal/personnel management need to "double back" to support the instructional goals. He gave an example of training on how to array categorical program funding to support instructional reform.

Rowland Baker mentioned the idea of a prerequisite that principals have simple skills in looking at data, and that they bring a CD to the training. He noted that principals need to know how to use the electronic materials they get. He also mentioned the question of "How do you use your budget to meet your instructional goals?"

Teresa Garcia described how Illinois has integrated technology with their principal training, using their Gates grant. She described how participants look at student scores, go to a computer, bring up the scores, manipulate the scores and print them out. She suggested listing what [technology training] must be covered, and requiring that it be integrated into the instructional portions of the training, but not explicitly saying what technology will be used.

Betsy Eaves stated that she wants to “vote for specificity.” California is “reculturing” accountability, starting with the needs of students and backing up the system. We haven’t yet involved the staff developers. This model seems overwhelming because it is hard work. Principals need technical help. The staff developer must have demanding requirements related to what happens to kids. The criteria should be specific and get principals to look at evidence, the connection to student achievement. This training can’t cover all things. It has to give principals specific training that will help their schools succeed in the accountability system.

Richard Navarro mentioned models of accomplished teaching, referencing the work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Alice Furry stated that models of teaching are specific to engaging with specific instructional programs. She explained that teaching practices are embedded in the criteria. The criteria do not cover broad models of teaching because teaching must be grounded in the instructional program.

Richard Navarro mentioned the importance of the role of principals in supporting struggling teachers. Alice Furry stated that the criteria include training in doing walk-throughs, grade-level meetings, and assessments that support this.

Rowland Baker stated that he is trying to get a concrete feel for what a provider plan will be. Alice Furry stated that she has never thought there would be a single provider. Rather, one provider would cover areas 2, 3, and 4. Another would cover area 5. She stated that integrating content from other areas in the instructional content areas would be problematic. Instead the instructional training will need to be very specific for each level. Dave Gordon reiterated that John Mockler suggested there would be a prime contractor, and that they would have subcontractors. Teresa Garcia explained that it was envisioned that a collection of providers would work together as a whole. Alice Furry responded that this makes sense and commented that it will take a lot of lead time for providers to put the training together. Richard Navarro noted the need for emphasis on the value of partnerships.

At this time a final speaker requested to speak.

Speaker: Linda Wisher, ACSA.

The speaker stated that she wished to reiterate some of comments made by Jay Schenierer. She encouraged the group to start with the end in mind and identify competencies. She expressed concern about having one delivery system. She also expressed concern about the demands on providers to provide training for elementary, middle and high school levels, and also at basic and advanced levels. In addition,



providers are expected to provide training that is tied to specific instructional programs. She stated that the number of providers who can deliver this training will be limited. She encouraged the interweaving of standards and the other two content areas into the instructional content areas. She also raised the question of how a participant will be assessed as basic or advanced if there are potentially 6 different areas to assess. She questioned if providers will be expected to assess and regroup around 6 different content areas.

### **Conclusion and Next Steps**

Dave Gordon acknowledged Alice Furry's work, saying she had done a fine job in a short time. He stated that he agreed with Jay Schenirer, that there should be more pedagogy in here. He stated that activities like the reflective essay are one mechanism for achieving an outcome, but there are others and he would like to see us expand other examples. He stated that he is concerned about elementary, middle, and high school differentiation. He stated that he doesn't know if we should try to steep high schools principals in several content areas. Their role is more about understanding instruction rather than specific content. He said that he would provide more detailed comments directly to Alice Furry.

Dave Gordon summarized some of the substantial issues from the meeting:

- There should be a strong preamble to the criteria document. This is crucial in order to sell to principals the idea that the training will be valuable in helping them to do their jobs and that it will not waste their time.
- The primary goal of the training program is to ensure that principals are able to help their teachers capably implement the chosen instructional program.
- We need to have a differential focus based on the needs of various levels: elementary, middle, and high school. Also requirements should be enforced upon providers of training, not school districts, unless districts elect to become their own providers.
- In response to the request for a recommended apportionment of time across the areas of training, Alice Furry is suggesting that 40 of the first 80 hours, and 60 of the second 80 hours, be spent on areas 2, 3, and 4. These should be recommend minimums.
- There seems to be strong agreement on the committee that there be available basic and advanced levels of training and that the training should dovetail with current school district training.
- The role of charter schools should be clarified in the document.
- The ways in which colleges can be providers across the first- and second-tier training should be clarified.
- The technology component should be implemented with an order of precedence. First priority should be the use of assessment and other data to better drive instruction. Second priority should be easing delivery of content. Third priority should be accessing instructional resources.
- With respect to business and finance issues, the committee feels that training should sharply focus on helping principals drive more resources toward standards-based instruction in the classroom.

The date of January 24<sup>th</sup> was selected for the next meeting, at 10 am.